

SUPPLEMENT TO
THE ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF POLITICAL
AND SOCIAL SCIENCE
MAY, 1910

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WOMAN SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT

SESSION OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF POLITICAL
AND SOCIAL SCIENCE, WEDNESDAY EVENING,
FEBRUARY 9, 1910

PHILADELPHIA
THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE
1910

Copyright, 1910, by the American Academy of Political and Social Science

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE ACADEMY. <i>L. S. Rowe</i>	5
INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER. <i>Robert L. Owen</i>	6
THE LOGICAL BASIS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE. <i>Anna G. Spencer</i>	10
THE POSITION OF THE ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS. <i>Mrs. Gilbert E. Jones</i>	16
THE WOMAN SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT IN GREAT BRITAIN. <i>Alice Paul</i>	23
ANSWER TO THE ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE. <i>Lyman Abbott</i>	28
WOMAN SUFFRAGE AN AID TO SOCIAL REFORM. <i>Mrs. Frederick Nathan</i>	33
THE INADVISABILITY OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE. <i>Charles H. Parkhurst</i>	36

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

BY DR. L. S. ROWE,
President of the Academy, Presenting the Presiding Officer.

Whatever may be one's view of the suffrage movement, no one can close his eyes to the fact that the women of the country have, within a very short time, taken the question out of the haze of ridicule in which it was enveloped, and secured for it the serious attention of the country.

It is a noteworthy fact that the men of the country, with some notable exceptions, have shown themselves singularly obtuse in their estimate of the situation, interpreting the movement solely in its political aspects, and without regard to its broader economic and social bearings.

Our presiding officer of this evening has been within this exceptional class. In the convention that framed the new constitution for the State of Oklahoma he took his stand on this broad ground, and although unsuccessful in obtaining all that he desired, he at least forced a full and fair consideration of the subject.

I have much pleasure in presenting him to you, as presiding officer of the evening—the Honorable Robert L. Owen, United States Senator from Oklahoma.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF PRESIDING OFFICER

BY HON. ROBERT L. OWEN,
United States Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: When invited to preside at this meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, for an evening devoted to the discussion of equal suffrage for women, I felt honor bound to do so. First because of my duty to women, my greatest benefactors, but above all by my duty to serve the good of society, the welfare of all the people, to the best of my understanding.

Women compose one-half of the human race. In the last forty years, women in gradually increasing numbers have been compelled to leave the home and enter the factory and work-shop. Over seven million women are so employed and the remainder of the sex are employed largely in domestic services. A full half of the work of the world is done by women. A careful study of the matter has demonstrated the vital fact that these working women receive a smaller wage for equal work than men do and that the smaller wage and harder conditions imposed on the woman worker are due to the lack of the ballot.

Many women have a very hard time and if the ballot would help them, even a little, I should like to see them have it. Carroll D. Wright, National Commissioner of Labor, in an address at Smith College on February 22, 1902, said: "The lack of direct political influence constitutes a powerful reason why women's wages have been kept at a minimum." This evidence is thoroughly established by the rise in women's wages for a given amount of work in those countries which have established the equal suffrage, as, New Zealand, South Australia, West Australia, Tasmania, Victoria, Colorado, Wyoming, Utah and Idaho.

I do not understand how a self-respecting man, after being satisfied of the truth of this statement, can deny to woman, as a human being, this opportunity to make her living decently, at a fair wage for a given amount of work. I know the ancient hostility and prejudice against women having equal rights. Under the old system

of government where the wages of men were abundant to take care of the home, and where the wife was mistress of a home, industriously engaged by the occupations of home, and supplied by a loving husband with materials for home use, it was a beautiful system and required no exercise of the suffrage. That system is almost entirely gone in many localities. It is absolutely gone with regard to millions of women, who work for their living with their own hands. More than seven million women are now supporting themselves outside the home and many millions of women in addition, are supporting themselves in the houses of those who are well off, by performing domestic service. Women whose husbands are well to do, do not appreciate the importance of equal pay for an equal amount of labor, desired by the poor woman who works in factory, or work-shop and perhaps is required to stand on her feet from ten to sixteen hours a day in order to earn a bare living. The rich woman does not see the neglected girl in the sweat-shop where her hopeless poverty is often preyed upon by the vice of men. I intend to do what I can to give women and working women, a fair opportunity to receive equal pay for equal work. I shall not mock their necessity by calling them queens of the homes, and then denying them the ballot, which is necessary to enable them to receive equal pay for equal work.

Equal pay for equal work is the first great reason justifying this change of governmental policy. There are other reasons which are persuasive: First, women, take it all in all, are the equals of men in intelligence, and no man has the hardihood to assert the contrary. To do so, subjects him to an instant intellectual and spiritual peril, which justifies the argument that such an assertion can not be maintained. The intelligence of women is devoted to objects in which they take a peculiar interest, and the same is true with men.

The man is usually better informed with regard to State government, but women are better informed about house government, and she can learn State government with as much facility as he can learn how to instruct children, properly feed and clothe the household, care for the sick, play on the piano, or make a house beautiful. It avails nothing to say that women are not familiar with State laws. They know pretty nearly as much as the average man, and if they had the right to participate, would soon know quite as much as the average man, and this would be a distinct gain in government for the whole community.

The woman ballot will not revolutionize the world. Its results in Colorado, for example, might have been anticipated. First, it did give women better wages for equal work; second, it led immediately to a number of laws the women wanted, and the first laws they demanded were laws for the protection of the children of the State, making it a misdemeanor to contribute to the delinquency of a child; laws for the improved care of defective children; also, the Juvenile Court for the conservation of wayward boys and girls; the better care of the insane, the deaf, the dumb, the blind; the curfew bell to keep children off the streets at night; raising the age of consent for girls; improving the reformatories and prisons of the State; improving the hospital service of the State; improving the sanitary laws, affecting the health of the homes of the State. Their interest in the public health is a matter of great importance. Above all, there resulted laws for improving the school system.

Several important results followed; both political parties were induced to put up cleaner, better men, for the women would not stand a notoriously corrupt or unclean candidate. The headquarters of political parties became more decent and the polling places became respectable. The bad women, enslaved by mercenary vice, do not vote and good women do vote in as great proportion as men. Every evil prophecy against granting the suffrage has failed. The public men of Colorado, Wyoming, Utah and Idaho give it a cordial support.

The testimony is universal:

First, it has not made women mannish; they still love their homes and children just the same as ever, and are better able to protect themselves and their children because of the ballot.

Second, they have not become office-seekers, nor pothouse politicians. They have not become swaggerers and insolent on the streets. They still teach good manners to men, as they always have done. It has made women broader and greatly increased the understanding of the community at large of the problems of good government; of proper sanitation, of pure food, of clean water, and all such matters in which intelligent women would naturally take an interest.

It has not absolutely regenerated society, but it has improved it. It has raised the educational qualification of the suffrage, and

has elevated the moral standard of the suffrage, because there are more criminal men than criminal women. In Colorado and Utah only two per cent of the prisoners in the penitentiary are women, and in Wyoming and Idaho there are no women prisoners.

The venerable Mrs. Eva Moore, of Guthrie, Oklahoma, put the argument in a nut-shell, when she said, in giving her reasons for wanting the ballot: "I am a human being, an individual, seventy-three years old, making my own living and my opportunity to do so is controlled by the law. My property rights are subject to the law.

"If I commit a crime, they may deprive me of my liberty, or of my life. Is there any righteous reason that I should not have a voice in the election of worthy, honorable men to make just laws and administer them?"

The great doctrine of the American Republic that "*all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed*," justifies the plea of one-half of the people, the women, to exercise the suffrage. The doctrine of the American Revolutionary War that taxation without representation is unendurable, justifies women in exercising the suffrage. One great advantage, however, of the suffrage is in raising women to a position of greater honor and dignity so that the children of the land shall show and feel greater reverence and honor for their mothers, and that the mothers may teach the elementary principles of good government while they are teaching them good manners, morality and religion.

No nation can rise higher than its women, and for this reason it is of prime importance to give the women of the land the suffrage, so as to elevate their status, and this, not alone for their sake, but for the sake of the whole community.

It is not alone that women need the ballot to protect their rights to a livelihood and to protect their children from vice, and to afford their children every means of instruction and guidance a civilized law should afford, but the country needs the female influence, because this influence will be especially exerted to improve the State charities, State sanitation, the protection of children and the beautifying of cities, and no possible harm can come from, according to the women of the land, this new respect and dignity. Are we afraid to trust our own wives, our own mothers, our own daughters! We can trust them with our lives and be assured of their fidelity and loyalty, and I, for one, intend to give them in public the confidence and trust I entertain in my private life.

THE LOGICAL BASIS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BY MRS. ANNA G. SPENCER,
Assistant Leader, Society for Ethical Culture, New York City.

The significance of the woman suffrage movement is two-fold; it is a response to the general movement of democracy toward the individuation of all members of all previously subjected or submerged classes of society; and it is also a social response to the new demands of citizenship which have followed inevitably the new and varied increase in the functions of government.

The response to the general movement toward democracy has in less than one hundred years changed the condition of woman in the chief centers of so-called Christian civilization from that of "status" to that of "contract"; a complete change from that condition in which the married woman while her husband lived could neither hold property, make a business contract, receive wages in her own right for her own work even outside the home, acquire legal power over her own children, act as guardian for a minor child, her own or another's, or in any manner acquire the rights of an adult individual, under the law. During her marriage, she was, as a minor child, protected in some manner against "abuse" (of which in quantity and in quality men and not women were the judges), but in no sense invested with the rights of an independent adult person under the law or in social, educational or industrial citizenship.

It was, of course, inevitable that the doctrine of the rights of man should come at last to include the rights of woman, just as it was inevitable that the rights of white men should come at last to include the rights of black and yellow and brown men. The great eighteenth century struggle in human progress was for the recognition of what Charles Sumner called "That equality of rights which is the first of rights." It was for a scheme and practice of political organization which should deny special privileges to any, which should secure liberty and greater justice in all the relations of life to all the different classes of men than had before been known. Although the winning of such measure of democracy in

government as we have attained does not bring in the millenium, and has not yet been applied perfectly enough even to men to fully measure its influence for good, any student of history can challenge the most pessimistic observer of American life to furnish an example of any more aristocratic form of government which has resulted in as high an average of physical, mental and moral well-being for the majority of the people as even such a partial democracy as our own. Women, since Abigail Adams demanded of the framers of our Constitution some recognition of the rights of women in their deliberations, have seen that there is no argument that can be framed for equality before the law for all classes of men that does not also apply with equal force to both sexes. The woman suffrage movement, however, is only as old as the immortal Seneca Falls meeting of 1848. That was a "Woman's Rights Meeting," and only incidentally and with hesitation pledged to a demand for the ballot; its chief stress being laid upon higher education for women, better industrial conditions, more just professional opportunity for qualified women, and larger social freedom; together with a strong appeal for the legal right of adult women to have and to hold property and to secure that "contract power" that marks the dividing line between a responsible person and a child or an imbecile.

There are two arguments, and only two, that can possibly be brought against the application of the general principles of democracy to law-abiding and mentally competent women—one is that women are not human beings; the other that they are a kind of human beings so different from men that general principles of right and wrong proved expedient as a basis of action in the development of men do not apply to them.

I take it that this company would not subscribe the ancient belief that "women have neither souls nor minds" but are a "delusion and a snare," invented for practical purposes of life, but not to be counted in when the real life of humanity is under consideration. Are then women of such a different sort of humanity that they do not need individual protection under the law, do not require the mental and moral discipline of freedom and personal responsibility for the development of character, are justly and fully provided for through the political arrangements of men, by men and for men, and therefore should be forcibly restrained from complete citizenship? Some, many, seem thus to believe.

The fact that women as a sex, not the favored few of a privileged class, but women as a sex have suffered every form of exploitation at the hands of men and without redress until very recently (an incontestable and easily demonstrated fact, attested by every law book of all Christendom), is sufficient answer to that. The further fact that until women initiated and carried through a great struggle, which although bloodless and pacific on their part, lacked no element of martyrdom, no woman could learn anything but the most elementary scraps of knowledge or develop her vocational power or attain industrial opportunity of any sort commensurate with her needs, is further attestation that women are not so different from men that they can be educated without a chance to go to school, be able to protect themselves against prostitution or ignoble dependence through self-support without the legal right to earn their own living or the legal right to hold and manage their property. Women are not so different from men as to become strong in character without having the discipline of moral responsibility or become broad minded and socially serviceable without the opportunity to "learn by doing" the duty of a citizen. Men and women are different, but not so unlike that they can become fully developed human beings in circumstances totally different.

The political democracy fought for in the eighteenth century, and partially obtained, led inevitably to the educational democracy struggled for and partially obtained in the nineteenth century, and most strikingly illustrated in the American public school. The industrial democracy now striving toward realization must follow the sharing of political rights and duties and the educational preparation for good and wise citizenship which we have in such large measure already attained. Now the democratizing of the family and of the social life is an inevitable and more and more conscious demand in order that we may have a home in which real and not sham, full-orbed and not partial, democracy may be nurtured and developed. Unless women are made a vital and a responsible part of democracy in education, and democracy in political service, and democracy in industrial organization, they cannot bear and rear fit citizens for a genuine and a matured democratic State. Thus, unless you repudiate democracy, you must finally include in its range of social influence all classes and both sexes.

The second element of significance in the woman suffrage

movement is the social response to the new demands of citizenship made by the new type of State which has been developed in this latter stage of human progress. The family and the Church used to take care of education; industry used to be a personal concern of domestic handicraft. Now all the functions of social order have been differentiated and started on separate but inter-related careers. The Church is not now a legal power; the school has become a function of the State; the new industrial order has necessitated legal protection of the weak and ignorant against the strong and shrewd. The State has gradually, and in these later days with astonishing celerity, taken over not only education, but charity and constructive social effort toward the common welfare. A thousand details of truly spiritual activity, which once were held solely within the sphere of the domestic and religious life, are now concerns of Government.

What are the great functions of social service for which "human beings of the mother sex" have been held chiefly responsible since society began? The care, the nurture, the development of child-life; the care of the sick, the aged and the infirm; the relief of the unfortunate; the protection and care of the defective; the general ministry of strength to weakness. These are the functions that the modern State has taken over from the home and from the Church. These are the functions the modern State *cannot perform without the direct and varied aid of women*. These are the modern State activities that make the largest army of public employees the teachers, of which ninety per cent. are women; and the next largest army the caretakers of the sick and insane and unfortunate of every kind, of which at least three-fourths are women. "Yes," but the anti-suffragist says, "women should work as subordinates for society through State employment, but they should not become a part of the political power of control and supervision." Then, if that be so, women are degraded from their ancient position in the office of personal ministry; for women, under the old régime of education, had command of the training of all the girls and all the little boys; and under the old régime in charity not only did the work, but determined what that work should be.

Now at last, struck with this fact, the anti-suffragist has taken the monstrously grotesque position that women should fill *appoint-*

ive positions of supervision and even of control in education and philanthropy, but should never be voted for or vote even on the political side of these functions. But an office like that of judge or overseer of the poor, which in one State is "appointive," may be in another State "elective." The constant tendency in the United States is for private initiative to create models in the educational and in the philanthropic field, for the appointive powers of executive office and legislative bodies of a few States to adopt these new models as a part of the State provision through specially appointed commissioners or boards, and for other States finally to copy the new idea through the regular channels of elective procedure. In private education and philanthropy women are expected to bear more than their full share in support, control and activity. When the State takes over tentatively as an experiment, some private enterprise, then, say even some of the most conservative anti-suffragists, a governor, or mayor, might properly take over also a selected woman or two to manage the interest of education and charity thus absorbed.

When, however, the people take over the school for the blind, the custodial home for the idiot, the asylum for the insane, the children's home, the care of the poor, the establishment of the city playground, the manifold enlargements of the public school provision for our cosmopolitan population, at what point does it become unwomanly for women to retain charge of their own special and inherited business? Where does it become improper or useless or unnecessary for women to protect children and youth, and with power to determine the conditions surrounding sister women in reformatories and prisons, and to secure right care for the aged, infirm and unfortunate? No living human being can find that point. Thousands of students of the modern social order and its historical bases in more primitive social organization can prove to any unprejudiced mind that social harm has resulted whenever and wherever these new functions of charity, of education, of social control, of public amusement, and of social effort toward personal welfare, have been taken over by the State from the home and the Church and the domestic shop and factory, without taking over also some recognized power of control by expert women as well as the subordinate service of women in general.

If, then, women are human beings and not so unlike men as

to render all human experience useless in the matter of their character development, they, too, as well as men, must be sent to school to political duty and responsibility if they are to rightly serve as mothers and teachers of potential citizens of democratic States.

If, then, the State, as can be easily proved, has taken on in modern times functions of dynamic social influence in education, in charity, in protection and development of the personal life, thus undertaking the things which, from the foundation of society, have been peculiarly "woman's sphere," it is as absurd as it is unwise and socially harmful to deprive the State of the service of women in all capacities of both subordinate activity and trained supervision and control.

This all means on both these grounds that women must be given the duty and the responsibility as well as the protection and the power of the ballot in order that there may be established a free, recognized and obvious channel by which the value of women's contribution to the State may be conserved and effectively applied to social welfare.

THE POSITION OF THE ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS

BY MRS. GILBERT E. JONES,
Chairman National League for the Civic Education of Women,
New York City.

The Anti-Suffragists are not organizing or rushing into committees, societies or associations, and their doings are not being cried out from the house-tops. Yet they show by undeniable facts, easily verified, that woman suffrage bills and proposals have been defeated and turned down at the rate of once in every twenty-seven days in the State legislatures for the last twelve years. The "Antis" have been especially successful in Kansas, where, in 1887, women obtained municipal suffrage. For twenty-two years the suffragists have tried to extend it to State and Federal suffrage, but without success, and the "Antis" seem to know why.

A great many States have granted to women school suffrage, but only a partisan or sectarian issue will bring out the woman's vote. In Massachusetts women have voted on school boards, and after thirty years' training, only two or three per cent. of the women register to vote. This hardly can be pronounced "success," or worth while. "Antis" do believe, however, that women can well serve on educational boards. With universal manhood suffrage there cannot exist such a condition as would warrant the suffragists to cry "taxation without representation is tyranny." Men do not vote because they pay taxes, why should women?

In the early history of our States, men and women voted because they paid taxes, property or money voted. But qualified suffrage has given way to "universal suffrage," because property qualifications were unrepblican, undemocratic, favoring the aristocratic wealthy citizens, and showing a decided discrimination against the educated and poorer citizens. The Anti-Suffragists generally believe the suffragists are asking for universal suffrage and *not* qualified suffrage, which tax-paying suffrage means. Taxation means protection and not representation. All books and authorities on "taxation" will tell any one caring for further information of this fact. Vatel, "Laws of Nations," says: "The

right to tax an individual results from the general protection afforded to himself and his property."

Judge Story says: "Where there is no protection there can be no claim to allegiance or obedience." "Taxes are a portion which each individual gives of his property, in order to secure and have the perfect employment of the remainder. Governments are established for the protection of persons and property within the limits of the State, and taxes are levied to enable the government to afford and give such protection. They are the price and consideration of the protection afforded." (J. Ingersoll, Circuit Court of the United States.) "There is nothing poetic about tax laws—When they find property, they claim a contribution for its protection." (Lowery, Chief Justice.)

Taxation without representation is tyranny, but we must be very careful to define what we mean by the phrase. If we adopt the suffrage attitude, "I pay taxes, therefore I should vote," the natural conclusion is that *everybody* who pays taxes should vote, or we have a tyrannical form of government. Remember that this argument is used in an unqualified way. We have a "tyranny" here we are told, because some women pay taxes, yet do not vote. If this is true without any qualification, it must be true not only of women, but of everybody. Accordingly this government is tyrannical if corporations pay taxes, but do not vote; if aliens pay taxes, but do not vote; if minors pay taxes, but do not vote; if anybody pays taxes, but does not vote. The only correct conclusion is, not that women should vote because some of them pay taxes, but that every taxpayer should be given the privilege of the ballot. Under our system of indirect taxation it is almost impossible to say that everybody is not a taxpayer—therefore it would seem that *every* man, woman and child, naturalized or alien, and every corporation, should vote. The absurdity of this is evident. Even if woman suffrage were granted, fifty per cent. of the population would still be without the ballot, and every one of these could stand up and say, as the suffragists are saying now, "Taxation without representation is tyranny." "I am taxed but unrepresented, therefore I am being tyrannized over."

It is clear that the phrase is distorted. The distortion lies in the fact that the suffragists are trying to make an individual right out of a principle of government. If women vote because they pay

direct taxes, many will be enfranchised who never earned a dollar, and who own their property wholly through the accident of inheritance. Thousands of women will be discriminated against, in favor of a few. Hundreds of women teachers would never have the advantages that a favored aristocracy of wealth would have. There would be a complete inequality of political privileges for women. Statesmen, lawyers, citizens, and the wise men from the North, South, East and West have been consulted, and have conscientiously discussed this question of who should vote, with the result that tax-paying qualifications have been done away with, and universal manhood suffrage has been generally adopted.

A very conscientious investigation by this League can not find that the ballot will help the wage earning woman. Women must resort to organization, association and trade unions, and then they can command and maintain a standard wage. Supply and demand will do the rest. Women are not well trained and often very deficient and unskilled in most of their occupations. They are generally only supplementary workers and drop their work when they marry. When married, and home and children are to be cared for, they are handicapped way beyond their strength. Married women should be kept out of industry, rather than urged into it, as scientists, physicians and sociologists all state that as women enter into competitive industrial life with men, just so does the death rate of little children increase and the birth rate decrease.

Anti-Suffragists deplore the fact that women are found in unsuitable occupations. But the suffragists glory in the fact that there are women blacksmiths, baggage masters, brakemen, undertakers, and women political "bosses" in Colorado.

The suffragists call this progress, independence and emancipation of women. Antis asks for more discrimination and better selection of industrial occupations for wage earning women. Knowing that the average woman has half of the physical strength of the average man, and the price she must pay when in competition with him is too great for her ultimate health, and her hope of motherhood, the "Antis" ask for caution and extreme consideration before new activities are entered upon.

Miss Sumner in her book, "Equal Suffrage," published by the Collegiate Equal Suffrage League, states that woman suffrage in Colorado has not fulfilled its expectations, and that the improved

salaries to be paid to women have not been realized. The average wages, even of women teachers, are still decidedly lower than those of men. She also tells us that many of the best laws in the interest of women and children have been passed, sometime *before* women were granted the franchise. Had women never voted, those laws would probably have been passed anyway; and in States where women do not vote, one finds better conditions for women, children and wage-earners than in the four suffrage States. This all goes to prove that the ballot in the hands of women is not essential for reforms, good laws, or the betterment of women and children.

The suffrage leaders say that a woman without the vote has no self-respect. We must then look to the suffrage States to find the fulfillment of the woman's true position, complete—worthy, exalted and respected. But what do we find when we look at Utah! Women have voted there for forty years. Mormonism and woman suffrage were coincident. By the very nature of its teachings, as indicated by Brigham Young, the basis of the Mormon Church is woman,—and the Mormon Church is the greatest political machine in the four suffrage States.

Women suffragists have lived openly and defiantly in a state of complete polygamy in Utah, and yet they have had the vote and political power. The only form of the Turkish harem found in the United States is in this woman suffrage State. Here we find the answer so often asked,—“If women vote, would a priest have power or influence over the women of this parish?” Utah answers the question—the Elders command—the woman's religious fervor makes her obey, and her hero worship of the Elder weakens her judgment. Polygamy was maintained in Utah for these reasons, and it was only when the Federal Government stepped in, that these un-American and unwholesome conditions were forbidden by law. Even now, that the Mormon woman can again vote, polygamy is not wholly done away with. Authorities say it never will be, until woman suffrage ceases, as sixty per cent. of the voters are women, and they keep the Mormon Church in power, as the Elders dictate.

With this state of affairs, do we find women more self-respecting where they vote, than where they do not? Is Utah a more self-respecting State for women, than Massachusetts? Martha Cannon was elected state senator. She was on the ticket against her husband, who was nominated for the same office on the Re-

publican ticket. I copy from the *Salt Lake Herald* a few sentences taken from an interview with Mrs. Cannon, state-senator-elect. When asked if she was a strong believer in woman suffrage, she answered, "Of course I am. It will help women to purify politics." "Women are better than men. Slaves are better than their masters." She was then asked, "Do you refer to polygamy?" "Indeed I do not" she answered. "I believe in polygamy,—a plural wife isn't half as much of a slave as a single wife. If her husband has four wives, she has three weeks of freedom every single month. Of course it is all over now, but I think the women of Utah think with me, that we were much better off with polygamy. Sixty per cent. of the voters of Utah are women. We control the State. What am I going to do with my children while I am making laws for the State? The same thing I have done with them, when I have been practicing medicine. They have been left to themselves a good deal. Some day there will be a law compelling people to have no more than a certain amount of children, and then the mothers of this land can live as they ought to live." This is the character and opinion presented by the *highest* State official that woman suffrage has as yet given to the United States of America. Do we want any more of them? Will not American women express their disapproval and disgust at such sentiments as these? We anti-suffragists glory over the fact that Utah is not an "anti" State. What would Miss Shaw say of us, "antis" and "polygamists!" Yet it has stood for forty years, and still stands, to as great a measure as they dare, woman suffrage and polygamy! Woman suffrage and polygamy, men and women with full political power, and religious freedom, were working together, and yet Mrs. Cannon and the woman suffragists speak of purifying politics! Here is their best example after a test of forty years and more. Why do the suffragists have so little to say about Utah? And why are there more Mormons in the four suffrage States than in all of our other States put together? Is it true that women will uplift the condition of women? Look to Utah and find the answer, because there they have full political power like men.

The question of woman suffrage should be summed up in this way: Has granting the ballot to women in the two suffrage States where they have had it for forty years brought about any great reforms or great results? No—Wyoming has many more men than

women, so the results cannot be measured. The Mormon women of Utah are not free American citizens. They are under the Elder's supreme power and vote accordingly, and polygamy has been maintained by the woman's vote, and is still to be found, although forbidden, because women have political power.

Have the saloons been abolished in any of the suffrage States? No.

Do men still drink and gamble? Yes, without doubt.

Have the slums been done away with? Indeed no.

Are the streets better cleaned in the States where women vote? No, they are quite as bad as in New York City and elsewhere.

Have the red-light districts been cleared away? Decidedly not, and they can be reckoned upon as a political factor, when they are really needed.

Have women purified politics? No, not in the least.

Have women voted voluntarily? Some do; but thousands are carried to the polls in autos and carriages, otherwise they would not vote.

Has pure food and pure milk been established by the woman's vote? Not at all.

Have women's wages been increased because women vote? No, indeed.

Have women equal pay for equal work? Not any more than in New York City.

Are there laws on the statute books that would give women equal pay for equal work? No, and never will be.

Are women treated with more respect in the four suffrage States than elsewhere. Not at all,—certainly not in Utah,—and when political men and women are working together, all kinds of men speak to women, and women cannot do anything but tolerate the political intruder,—as men and women are equal where women vote.

Women suffragists believe suffrage is a success in the above-mentioned four States—and they have ample *suffrage* testimony to satisfy them.

The "antis" in their investigation find positive proof that many men and women can not tolerate the suffrage for women and pronounce it a failure.

The real truth is that woman suffrage is absolutely *futile*,

neither good nor bad, but unnecessary. What women accomplish in all other States *without* the votes, that denotes progress, reforms and betterment of conditions for women, children and humanity, is solely attributed to the ballot in the States where women vote. The franchise granted to women, means a doubling of all the evils now existing in manhood suffrage and this cannot mean progress.

"In the tabernacle of life, man dwells in the outer courts, woman ministers at the holy of holies—her influence upon humanity is so primal, so intimate, so dominant, that it might seem almost divine. Herein lies her superiority. In coarse and common service, in the race of the swift and the battle of the strong, man immeasurably outstrips her. In the higher service of love, which lies above battle-field and race course, of whose ministry God himself is the only exemplar, she holds a position so advanced that man is not even her competitor."

THE WOMAN SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT IN GREAT BRITAIN

BY ALICE PAUL,
Moorestown, N. J.

In 1832 the franchise which had previously belonged to women was taken from them, and its loss seems to have aroused scarcely a murmur of protest. Now, after the lapse of less than one hundred years, the demand of women for the vote has grown so insistent that their enfranchisement cannot much longer be delayed. And this demand is not confined to a small group of intellectuals, as in the early days of the agitation, but is coming from the hearts of women of all classes—the mill girl, the university woman, the member of the nobility.

This alteration in the attitude toward the franchise is of profound significance as an indication of the great change which has been going on, quietly and almost unnoticed, in the economic and social life of woman. The suffrage movement is a milestone marking another step in her evolution. "To give votes to women would be a revolution," one is told again and again in Great Britain. But the revolution is already accomplished. The giving of the ballot would be but the public recognition of the change which social forces have brought about.

Industrial development has created a situation in which there are five million women in the labor market. In Lancashire sixty-two per cent. go out to work. In Manchester and Birmingham sixty-three per cent. In Stockport and Dundee even a larger number. It is too late now to say to these communities: "Women should not vote, their place is the home." It might have been listened to in the days before the industrial revolution, when woman's work was done in her home. But now she has been forced to play her part in the world in competition with men. It was inevitable that she should protest against being handicapped in this struggle by the denial of the protection of the ballot.

Educational opportunities for women have been won at last, though there is still much to be obtained. To-day one listens with

wonder as the elder women tell of the bitter opposition which greeted their entrance into the educational world. At Oxford and Cambridge we see a relic of the old barriers in the refusal of the universities to grant their degrees to women who have completed the work and who may have passed the examinations with higher honors than have any of the men. Again, in the technical instruction which is being introduced to-day one sees the same old sex discrimination, almost all of the opportunities for technical training being given to boys.

In the professional world she has forced her way, though here, too, there are still some gates that are barred. All the higher positions under the government are closed to her, and she is excluded from the legal profession, for example. One begins to realize, however, how much has been achieved when one listens to a woman doctor telling of her early days—of the ridicule and even personal violence which the pioneers had to face. And it is even a greater step to the time when Dr. Johnson denounced portrait painting and literature as unsuitable pursuits for “delicate females”—and the world apparently agreed.

The British woman takes much greater part in political life than does the woman in our own country. For a long time she has been in evidence at every election, canvassing and speaking for the various men's parties. From instructing the electors how to vote to demanding the ballot for herself was but a natural step. The first Primrose dame was the mother of the Suffragettes. And yet it is not so long ago that the political field, too, was closed. One who is still active in public life has told us that in her youth it was only by being concealed behind curtains that she could attend a political meeting—so improper was the appearance of a woman at such an affair considered.

In social activities, again one sees the revolution in her status. To-day, when her active help is sought whenever a scheme for social reform is undertaken, it is difficult to realize that as recently as 1840, at an anti-slavery conference in London, the women delegates were refused admittance by the men.

The laws have not kept pace with this changed position of women, though the old divine right of husbands has been somewhat modified. In 1882 the married woman's property act gave

her some measure of legal freedom. But even to-day the married woman has no claim whatever upon her husband for maintenance, except that he may not allow her to reach a state of such starvation as to make her chargeable to the parish. Even though he be a millionaire his wife can legally claim from him nothing beyond this minimum necessary to preserve life. The wife, it should be noticed, is liable for the support of her husband.

The divorce laws are notoriously unfair. While a man can secure divorce on the ground of his wife's adultery, she must prove in addition to adultery, cruelty or bigamy, or two years' desertion. The legacy laws also discriminate against her. One of the most grievous hardships is in the law which gives the entire control of the children to the father, when the parents live together, and allows him to dispose of them without regard to the wishes of the mother.

A man's right of control over the person of his wife has been greatly decreased. In the famous Jackson case it was decided that a husband may not imprison his wife. She is bound, however, to go with him anywhere at his desire. Recently a man in the Hampstead Infirmary, London, had the power, according to the law, to compel his wife to remain in the workhouse attached to the institution, though by living with her family she was able to earn her living, and was anxious to do so. In one case the vice-chancellor held that it was the duty of the wife to submit to her husband in event of a difference of opinion and that the husband was "king and ruler in his own family."

In the world of ideas there has been even less reflection of the changed status of woman, and it is in this realm that the great battle, it seems to me, is being fought to-day. Current opinion at the end of the eighteenth century seems to have regarded a man as a personality—precious as a personality—but a woman as merely an appendage to man, and precious only because of her connection with him. "The chief end of man," says the Scottish catechism is "to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever." But the chief end of woman seems to have been held, as Mrs. Fawcett put it, "To glorify man and to help him enjoy himself for a little time." This old idea of women as created solely in order to minister to man is akin to the idea that the working man's whole purpose in the world is to

contribute to the happiness of the upper classes. Both ideas have been hard to kill. Both still survive in this country, we know, but apparently are much more widely held in Great Britain. In the homes of the five million women wage-earners the "half angel, half idiot" conception of woman, has died a natural death. In the multitude of homes where she is the chief bread winner the old ideal, which presented weakness and dependence as her highest virtues, could not survive. These ideas, born of a different environment than the present, are still, however, widely spread through the land.

An account of the many restrictions surrounding women at the end of the eighteenth century makes strange reading in the present. But in reading of the ideals established for them then, there is no unfamiliar note. In England to-day those words of Rousseau might have been written: "To please, to be useful to us, to make us love and esteem them, to educate us when young and take care of us when grown up, to advise, to console, to render our lives easy, and agreeable; these are the duties of women at all times and what they should be taught in their infancy." Mr. John Burns, a member of the present Cabinet, preached exactly this ideal to a class of graduating girls last year. The feeling that woman is an inferior is evident even in the social world of London, where, as Miss Ethel Arnold told us the other day, the first principle is that the men must be entertained whatever else happens. It is revealed in the cry of the gamin: "Votes for women, votes for dogs!" Constantly one sees this attitude in the press where a meeting is reported as of no importance, as "there were only women present." The opposition to the suffrage is eloquent of this view of women. One finds it is not argument one is combating, but a deep-rooted prejudice, which feels that all is well when woman bows in reverence to man, and says with Milton's Eve:

"God is thy law, thou mine; to know no more
Is woman's happiest knowledge and her praise."

It is cause for rejoicing, conditions being as they are, that the suffrage has not been won without a hard struggle in Great Britain, for the struggle has done much to help women throw off their mental bondage. It has kindled in their hearts a great spirit

of rebellion against their subjection. It has developed a self-respect, a respect for their sex, unknown before. On all hands one hears it said: "A new race of women is developing before our eyes"—a type which has discarded the old ideal of physical, and mental, and moral dependence, and has substituted the ideal of strength.

ANSWER TO THE ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE¹

BY LYMAN ABBOTT,
Editor-in-Chief *The Outlook*, New York.

In my study of the suffrage movement, and it has been a subject of study with me for fifty years past, I have discovered but five arguments in support of this revolutionary demand.

It is claimed that the suffrage is a natural right, as much so as the rights of person and of property, and that we must do justice though the heavens fall. The notion that suffrage is a natural right is a relic of the French Revolution which has not survived in political philosophy the doctrinaires who gave birth to it. The rights of person are absolute and unconditioned. Whatever his age and condition, the child has a right to his life—killing the unborn infant is murder; his right to his property is absolute and unconditioned—if he is not old enough to administer it himself, a guardian is appointed, or his natural guardian is intrusted with its keeping and its care. But the right of suffrage is always determined by the community which grants it; it depends upon an age artificially determined on, upon a residence artificially defined. The would-be voter must have resided in the Nation a certain number of years, in the State a certain number of months, in the District a certain number of days. In some States he must have an educational qualification, in others a property qualification, and in others he must have paid taxes. But the payment of taxes does not give him a right to vote. He may pay taxes in every State in the Union, and in every county of the State, but he can vote only in one county of one State. Suffrage is a prerogative conferred by the community and conditioned when it is conferred. A man has no more natural right to vote in a political campaign than he has to vote in a State Legislature.

It is claimed that women must be given the suffrage to protect themselves from the injuries inflicted on them by men. I confess

¹Reprinted by permission from a paper on "The Profession of Motherhood," by Lyman Abbott in *The Outlook*, April 10, 1909.

that this claim arouses my indignation. To set class against class is bad, to set race against race is worse, to set religion against religion is even more perilous; but to set sex against sex is a degradation so deep that political polemics can no further go. That a hundred years ago women suffered under legal limitations which worked injustice is undoubtedly true. Some of them were framed for women's protection; others of them were a relic of an earlier barbarism. Both have disappeared with advancing civilization. All lawyers know that the prejudice of all juries and of many judges is in favor of woman in any case in which a woman is involved. All legislators know that a woman's lobby is a most difficult one to resist. If there are any disabilities under which women still suffer because they are women, I venture to affirm that a common appeal by women would invariably and quickly bring their repeal. I do not forget the appeal made last year by the teachers of New York City for a law requiring equal wages for equal work. But it was not an appeal by woman for woman; it was an appeal by a special class for that class. It was rightly vetoed by the Governor, for it violated the fundamental principle which has prevailed throughout the State of New York and, I believe, throughout all other States, according to which the details of school administration are left to the district in which the schools are situated; and it was irrational, because no man can exert a woman's influence and no woman can exert a man's influence in the school-room, so that neither can do the other's work. That the suffrage is not necessary to protect woman against the oppressions of man is strikingly illustrated by a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in which it was decided that a law limiting the hours of woman's labor in the factory is constitutional and that she has a special right to protection by the law because of her special disadvantages, a right which the man working at her side does not possess.

This decision, rendered by a masculine court, upon briefs presented by masculine lawyers, serves to furnish at least an illustrative reply to those who contend that woman's suffrage is necessary to benefit the condition of woman wage-earners. Whatever legislation can accomplish for women wage-earners, this decision makes clear, can be accomplished under present conditions. What cannot be accomplished by legislation cannot be accomplished by suffrage. I have looked in vain in the publications of the woman

suffragists for any facts to show even remotely that political suffrage involves economic gain. It is true that the farm laborers of England obtained the suffrage and afterwards obtained increase of wages, but *post hoc* is not *propter hoc*, nor has any evidence been adduced that the improved industrial conditions were due to the changed political conditions. In our own country it is certain that the industrial condition of the negro under limited suffrage is far better than it was in the reconstruction period under unlimited suffrage, but it would be illogical to claim that the limitation of the suffrage has promoted economic welfare.

It is also claimed, with what adequacy of evidence I do not know, that wage-earning women desire the ballot, not merely, perhaps not mainly, because it will increase their wage, but because, as a symbol of equality, it would secure for them a greater respect in business dealings with men. The fact that twenty per cent. of women are wage-earners and that only five per cent. of the women in industrial Massachusetts voted that they wished the suffrage, does not confirm this claim. But were it true, what then? Over two-thirds of the wage-earning women in the United States cease to be wage-earners at thirty-five; over half cease to be wage-earners at twenty-five; that is, wage-earning largely ceases at the marrying age. It would be interesting to know how many of the wage-earning women who want the ballot as a symbol of equality before marriage desire its responsibilities after marriage. Certainly it is clear that those responsibilities should not be imposed on eighty per cent. of the women of the United States on a vague suspicion that an unknown proportion of twenty per cent. of temporarily employed wage-earners think it might add to their business standing during their temporary engagement in business.

Finally, we are asked to impose the ballot upon women as a means of securing moral reforms which the men are either unwilling or incompetent to accomplish. Perhaps the argument which has been most effective to counterbalance the objection of women to assume the responsibilities of the suffrage has been the argument that they could vote for the abolition of the saloon. In the ancient legend, St. George rescues the maiden from the dragon. I confess that I have small sympathy with the spirit which calls on the maiden to fight the dragon and leaves St. George on the other side of the wall looking on to see how the conflict will terminate. The

women who are affected by this argument, and perhaps the women who use it, forget that Hebrew history had a Jezebel as well as a Queen Esther, and a European history a Lucretia Borgia and a Catherine de Medici as well as a Queen Victoria. Vice, ignorance, and superstition are not confined to either sex. Advocates of woman's suffrage aver improvement of conditions in woman suffrage States; opponents of woman's suffrage aver deteriorated conditions in woman suffrage States. Into the contention between these two classes of observers, each of whom probably see what they wish to see, I decline to enter. I accept instead the testimony of such impartial observers as the President of the United States, who has said: "I am unable to see that there has been any special improvement in the position of women in those States in the West that have adopted woman suffrage as compared with those States adjoining them that have not adopted it. I do not think that giving the women suffrage will produce any marked improvement in the condition of women." I accept the testimony of Mr. Root, in a published letter from him based on his certainly large opportunities for a study of this question: "I do not myself consider that the granting of suffrage to women would, under the existing conditions, be any improvement in our system of government. On the contrary, I think it would rather reduce than increase the electoral efficiency of our people." I accept the testimony of Mr. James Bryce, as disinterested, impartial, and sympathetic an observer of American conditions as America has ever known: "No evidence has come in my way tending to show that politics either in Wyoming or in Washington are in any way purer than in the adjoining States and Territories. The most that seems to be alleged is that they are no worse; or, as the Americans express it, 'Things are very much what they were before, only more so.'" This was published in 1888. It is safe to say that nothing has occurred within the last twenty years materially to change this judgment.²

President Roosevelt, in his address before the Mothers' Meeting in Washington in 1905, said: "The primary duty of the husband is to be the home-maker, the breadwinner for his wife and children

²For Mr. Roosevelt's and Mr. Root's letters see *The Outlook* for December 19, 1908, p. 849; for Mr. Bryce's testimony see *The American Commonwealth*, Vol. III, p. 297.

(and, may I add, to be her protector from violence); the primary duty of the woman is to be the helpmeet, the housewife and mother." In these words Mr. Roosevelt has gone to the heart of the woman question. The call to woman to leave her duty to take up man's duties is an impossible call. The call on man to impose on woman his duty, in addition to hers, is an unjust call. Fathers, husbands, brothers, speaking for the silent women, I claim for them the right to be exempt in the future from the burden from which they have been exempt in the past. Mothers, wives, sisters, I urge you not to allow yourselves to be enticed into assuming functions for which you have no inclination, by appeals to your spirit of self-sacrifice. Woman's instinct is the star that guides her to her divinely appointed life, and it guides to the manger where an infant is laid.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE AN AID TO SOCIAL REFORM

BY MRS. FREDERICK NATHAN,

Vice-President National Consumers' League, and President Consumers'
League of the City of New York.

After hearing the interesting addresses of those upon the evening's program, it seems superfluous for me to add a jot of testimony. Yet, I appreciate your kindness in expressing a desire to have a few words from me, and, with your permission, I shall relate one or two personal experiences:

I have, as you doubtless know, worked for many years in connection with the Consumers' League, in endeavoring to secure protective legislation for working girls and children. Year after year I have gone to Albany to plead for shorter hours or for restriction of night work, or for stricter supervision of dangerous machinery, left unguarded. Each year the fact is borne in upon me with greater and greater force that we women would not find it so difficult to secure legislation, were we the constituents of the legislators. For the legislators point out to us time and again that they are pledged to support the wishes of their constituents. I have noticed that the *direct influence* of the few merchants and manufacturers who oppose our measures has apparently much more weight with them than the *indirect influence* of the thousands of women interested in having the measures passed.

To give you one instance of this difference between direct influence and indirect influence, let me relate what happened last year when we tried to get the labor laws amended. We asked whether it would be possible to have a joint hearing of the bill before the Senate and Assembly committees, in order to be relieved of the necessity of going to Albany on two different occasions; we were told politely, but firmly, that it would be out of the question, that we would be obliged to attend the Assembly committee hearing on one day and the Senate committee hearing on another day later on. So several of us journeyed to Albany on the day fixed for the hearing before the Assembly committee, only to be told after reaching the Capitol, that the hearing had been postponed for one week.

We asked why we had not been notified, and we were told that there had been no time to notify us. We ascertained later, however, that the postponement had been arranged the evening before, (therefore a telegram or telephone message would have reached us) and had been due to the fact that one of the merchants opposing our measure had requested by telephone a joint hearing before the two committees, in order to be spared the necessity of making two trips to Albany!

His request, which was identical with ours, was acceded to at once. Therefore, we women of the Consumers' League were compelled to make two journeys, at double the expense, not only of transportation, but also of energy and time, merely because the indirect influence of the non-voter is not as efficacious as the direct influence of the voter. Moreover, when we finally presented ourselves at the Capitol for the joint hearing, which had been fixed for two p. m., we were compelled to wait more than three hours, and were then limited to twenty minutes to each side. A hearing on another bill was given precedence, without any time limit having been fixed. When I ingenuously asked for an explanation, I was told by one of the committee that the bill in question was a very important one, as the speakers represented a large number of *voters*. The bill was in reference to a demand on the part of Spanish-American War veterans to be excused from Civil Service examinations.

As the opponents of all bills are heard first, the merchants who opposed our measure were heard shortly after five o'clock, and as they took more than their allotted time, it was nearly the hour of adjournment, according to the statement of the chairman, before we were able to present our side of the case. Hence only the most hurried and insufficient presentation was allowed us.

On one occasion last year, when I was visiting the night court, there were twenty young women who had been arrested, brought before the magistrate. They were kept standing, crowded together in the room adjoining the court, and I noticed policemen and reporters jostling by them, staring at them, and occasionally addressing them. They had been arrested because they had been found presumably drinking, sitting in the back room of a saloon which had been raided. I asked where their male escorts were, for I felt sure the occupants of the room had not all been of the feminine

sex. I was told that all the men had escaped. I was inclined to marvel at their unanimous agility until it was explained to me that men with political pulls were sometimes permitted to escape.

Only recently when my friend, Miss Inez Milholland, was arrested for having lingered on the street to watch the picketing during the shirt-waist strike, she was held on charges, while her escort, Lieutenant Tawney, who had done no less than she had, was dismissed at once. The shirt-waist strikers, the majority of them frail young girls, were fined far more heavily and punished far more severely than were the striking taxi-cab chauffeurs of a year ago, although the latter committed much more violence and of a far more serious nature.

In view of these facts, is it strange that many women feel that if they had the same political status as men, much of this flagrant injustice would cease?

Now just a word in reference to a statement made by Mrs. Gilbert Jones. If you will examine the labor laws of the different states, and the laws regarding equal pay for equal work, you will find that the four states in which women are enfranchised have the best laws for the protection of women and children of any four states in the Union.

THE INADVISABILITY OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE¹

BY REV. CHARLES H. PARKHURST, D. D.,
New York City.

The problem we confront is not the mere problem of the ballot. That is but a feature. That ballot business is only a single aspect of a vastly larger whole—and the outdistancing conspicuity into which that single aspect has been femininely foisted, suggests nothing so distinctly as it does the logical infirmity of mind which constitutes one of the weaknesses, and I might also say, one of the charms of the feminine constitution. Woman, of course, has a great deal that man has not, but her premises and her conclusions are apt to live so far apart as to fail of becoming more than imperfectly acquainted. This is spoken with no flavor of disrespect. Neither sex has everything; otherwise there would have been no advantage in having two.

Biologists tell us that the higher we go in the scale of animal life, the more the respective functions of the two sexes become differentiated, more and more widely separated from each other in their quality, aptitude and mission. From which we have to conclude that the finer the type of human civilization, the more widely apart man and woman will become, in all that relates to the ingredients of their personality and therefore to their interests and their respective spheres of service.

That is the first criticism to be passed on what is just now transpiring, that it is not being conducted on the basis of principles that have been thoroughly canvassed; that an attempt is being made to accomplish something without first discovering whether it fits logically into the framework of sociological principle and historic trend.

No; we men have put woman on a high pedestal; not so far above us that we cannot reach her, but so far above us that we cannot reach her without reaching up. She will have to be infinitely careful or she will knock herself off that pedestal, and when she gets down to that point where the only recognizable differ-

¹Extracts from an address delivered in New York, December 17, 1909.

ence between her and man lies in the unlikeness of her garments and in some anatomical discrepancies, her supreme prerogative will all have been sacrificed, her distinctive influence as woman will all of it have gone.

Woman will get all she wants if she is woman in her way of getting it; but if she is man in her way of getting it she will not get more than half of what she wants. So far as she resorts to purely masculine implements in her attainment of a feminine victory she will count only as man. One woman will count only as one man, whereas by endowment of nature and of God she ought to count as one and a fraction, perhaps two. Votes do not settle anything. The settling is all done before the balloting begins. Votes simply register what has been settled previously. If women will remain women, and very much so, and will recognize that as such they stand on higher ground than man and will *stick* to that higher ground, they will do the settling; whereas, if they come down to man's lower level they will have to take their chances and will mean no more in the shaping of events than they would have done had they been born members of the other sex.

The distinctive genius of woman is lodged not in her logical nor in her executive faculties, but in her sensibilities. Of course we are not so ignorant of history and of biography as not to know that there are exceptions to that, and very marked exceptions. For instance, we have not forgotten Queen Elizabeth, who, however, in her general composition was far more masculine than feminine. We remember too that it is reported of Mary Somerville that she was the only person, male or female, that perfectly comprehended the *Mécanique Céleste* of La Place. But even so, the exceptions are insufficiently numerous to invalidate the assertion, that woman's genius is lodged in her sensibilities and therefore in her faculty for appealing to personality, for the world is governed by heart and not by intellect, and woman has the heart; that is she has, if she is finely feminine, just as it is the caloric thread, not the luminous thread, of the sunbeam that makes the trees grow. So that whatever work woman does that does not involve the exercise of sensibilities is to that extent a waste of woman.

The History of the County of York

The County of York is one of the most fertile and populous in the Kingdom. It is bounded on the north by the County of Lincoln, on the east by the County of Northampton, on the south by the County of Lincoln, and on the west by the County of Lincoln. The River Ouse flows through the County, and is the chief source of its fertility. The County is divided into four parts, viz. the City of York, the County of York, the County of Lincoln, and the County of Northampton. The City of York is the chief town of the County, and is one of the most ancient and important cities in the Kingdom. The County of York is the most fertile and populous of the four parts, and is the chief source of the County's wealth. The County of Lincoln is the most fertile and populous of the four parts, and is the chief source of the County's wealth. The County of Northampton is the most fertile and populous of the four parts, and is the chief source of the County's wealth.

GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.
JUN 7 1910

Supplement to
THE ANNALS of
THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF POLITICAL
AND SOCIAL SCIENCE
MAY, 1910

Significance of the Woman Suffrage Movement

*Session of the American Academy
of Political and Social Science
Wednesday evening, February 9, 1910*

PHILADELPHIA
The American Academy of Political and Social Science



